Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary					
Application No.: <u>09/618,950</u>	First Named Applicant: Brian Lo Bue				
Examiner: Aaron N. Strange	Art Unit: 2153 Status of Application: Pending				
Participants: (1) John P. Schaub (2) Aaron N. Strange					
(3)	(4)				
Date of Interview: 7/31/2008	Time: 3:00 PM (EDT)				
Type of Interview: (a) [X] Telephonic	(b) [] Personal	(c) []	(c) [] Video Conference		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: If yes, provide brief description:	, ,	•			
Issues Discussed					
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed	
(1) <u>§ 103 Rej.</u> <u>1</u> (2)	Ben-Dor et al.	[X] []	[X] []	[]	
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Amendment attached					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:					
A proposed amendment to Claim 1 was discussed. No agreement was reached.					
2. Proposed new dependent claims further describing configuration of the candidate list were discussed. No agreement was reached.					
3. Proposed new dependent claims describing re-generation of the candidate list were discussed. No agreement was reached.					
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.					
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)					
(Applicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature)				